## FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENWOOD DIVISION

Michael Shealy, vs.	Plaintiff,	) Civil Action No. 8:10-574-JMC-KFM ) ORDER )
Georgia-Pacific Wood Products, LLC,		)
	Defendant.	) ) )

This matter is before the court on the plaintiff's motion for extension of time to complete discovery (doc. 27). The plaintiff alleges that the defendant, his former employer, terminated his employment because of his age and a perception of disability, in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA") and the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA").

Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(A), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(g), D.S.C., all pretrial matters in employment discrimination cases are referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for consideration.

A telephone hearing on the motion was held before this court on Friday, January 21, 2011. Based upon the parties' written briefs and arguments in the hearing, this court finds that the interests of justice weigh in favor of reopening discovery until **Friday, February 18, 2011**, for the limited purpose of the taking of the depositions of John Evans, Patrick Alexander, and Bridget Hawkins. No further depositions or written discovery will be allowed. The defendant will then have until **Monday, February 28, 2011**, to supplement its motion for summary judgment if it so chooses. The plaintiff's opposition to the motion for summary judgment will be due on or before **Friday, March 11, 2011**. The

8:10-cv-00574-JMC Date Filed 01/21/11 Entry Number 44 Page 2 of 2

amendment of these dates in the scheduling order also requires that subsequent dates be amended. The amended deadlines are set forth below:

Mediation shall be completed on or before **Friday**, **April 8**, **2011**.

Rule 26(a)(3) pretrial disclosures shall be exchanged no later than **Monday**, **April 11**, **2011**.

Motions in limine must be filed on or before **Monday, April 18, 2011**.

The remaining dates in the scheduling order remain unchanged.

Wherefore, based upon the foregoing, the plaintiff's motion for extension of time to complete discovery (doc. 27) is granted in part and denied in part as set forth above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Kevin F. McDonald United States Magistrate Judge

January 21, 2011

Greenville, South Carolina